

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| l | APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| ٠ | 09/749,980 | 12/27/2000 | Elaine Lee | 8600-0010 | 6822 |
| | | 7590 04/03/200 PASTERNAK LLP | 7 | EXAMINER | |
| 1731 EMBARCADERO ROAD, SUITE 230 | | | ΓE 230 | REIMERS, ANNETTE R | |
| PALO ALTO, CA 94303 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | |
| | | | | 3733 | |
| _ | | | | | |
| l | SHORTENED STATUTOR | Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 3 MONTHS | | NTHS | 04/03/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

| | | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | | 09/749,980 | LEE, ELAINE | | | | |
| • | Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | · | Annette R. Reimers | 3733 | | | | |
| | The MAILING DATE of this communication ap | pears on the cover sheet with the | correspondence address | | | | |
| | Period for Reply | | | | | | |
| WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r | A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filled after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filled, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| Status | • | | | | | | |
| 1)🖂 | Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>13 March 2007</u> . | | | | | | |
| | | s action is non-final. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| , | closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | |
| Dispositi | on of Claims | | | | | | |
| 4)🖾 |)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,5-11,14-16,19,22-24,31,32 and 34-37</u> is/are pending in the application. | | | | | | |
| | 4a) Of the above claim(s) 5,6,22,31,32 and 34-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) | 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ | 6) Claim(s) 1,7-11,14-16,19,23 and 24 is/are rejected. | | | | | | |
| 7) | 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8)□ | 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Applicati | on Papers | | | | | | |
| 9) 🗌 🤈 | 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 10) | 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| | Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | |
| 🗂 | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) | 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | |
| Priority u | ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119 | • | | | | | |
| | 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | |
| | 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. | | | | | | |
| | 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No | | | | | | |
| | 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage | | | | | | |
| | application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | | | | | | |
| * S | * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| - | | | | | | | |
| Attachmen | t(s) | | | | | | |
| | e of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summar | | | | | |
| | e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | Paper No(s)/Mail [5) Notice of Informal | | | | | |
| | r No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |

N

DETAILED ACTION

Upon further consideration, the final office action, mailed February 12, 2007, has been vacated. A new office action follows.

Claim Objections

Claim 7 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. In this case, applicant has already claimed a thrombus-stabilizing molecule in claim 1. Therefore, claim 7 does not appear to further limit claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States

Claims 1, 7, 8, 11, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Schwartz (US Patent Number 5,957,971).

Schwartz discloses a vaso-occlusive coil for treating aneurysms having a fibrin/thrombus-stabilizing molecule, e.g. Factor XIII, bioactive coating (see various embodiments disclosed in figures 1-3).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz (US Patent Number 5,957,971) in view of Schwarz et al. (US Patent Number 4,414,976) (cited by examiner on 892, paper number 04222004).

Schwartz discloses the claimed invention except the thrombus-stabilizing molecule being plasminogen activator inhibitor or plasmin inhibitor Schwarz teaches that tissue adhesive for use in vascular surgery may be made with Factor XIII, plasminogen activator inhibitor or plasmin inhibitor in order to stimulate wound healing (Column 1 lines 37-44). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the device of Schwartz with the thrombus-stabilizing molecule being plasminogen activator inhibitor or plasmin inhibitor, in view of Schwarz, in order to promote healing.

Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz (US Patent Number 5,957,971) in view of Slaikeu et al. (US Patent Number 6,231,590) (cited by examiner on 892, paper number 16)

Schwartz discloses the claimed invention except for the member being plasmatreated. Slaikeu teaches that devices are plasma treated in order to attract platelets and thrombogenic proteins to the device (Column 4 lines 57-65). It would have been

implantation site.

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the device of Schwartz, with a plasma treatment, in view of Slaikeu et al., in order to attract platelets and thrombogenic proteins and thus promote healing at the

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over unpatentable over Schwartz (US Patent Number 5,957,971) in view of Murayama et al. (US Patent Number 5,891,192) (previously cited by examiner)

Schwartz discloses the claimed invention except for the vaso-occlusive member being subjected to ion-implantation. Murayama et al. teach that ion implantation is used to alter the surface properties, such as thrombogenicity and endothelial cellular migration and adhesion, of the device (Column 3 lines 21-29). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the device of Schwartz with ion-implantation in view of Murayama et al., in order to alter the thrombogenicity and endothelial cellular migration and adhesion.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwartz (US Patent Number 5,957,971) in view of Nikolchev et al. (US Patent Number 6,526,979) (cited by examiner on 892, paper number 16)

Schwartz discloses the claimed invention except for the vaso-occlusive member being microtextured. Nikolchev discloses that an occlusive member is microtextured in order to promote tissue ingrowth and enhance the occlusion of the vessel (Column 14 lines 9-37). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to provide the device of Schwartz with the microtexturing in view of Nikolchev, in order to enhance tissue ingrowth and occlude the vessel.

Page 5

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 7-11, 14-16, 19, 23 and 24 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO 892 for art cited of interest.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Annette R. Reimers whose telephone number is (571) 272-7135. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eduardo Robert can be reached on (571) 272-4719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 09/749,980

Art Unit: 3733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Page 6